



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

HOW SHOULD SOCIOLOGY BE TAUGHT AS A COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY SUBJECT?

PROFESSOR CHARLES A. ELLWOOD
University of Missouri

Sociology may be defined, in the narrow sense, as the theory, on the one hand, of social organization, and, on the other, of social evolution. In other words, it is the biology and psychology of the associational process. But I assume that in a department of sociology in a college or university closely related subjects, other than sociology in this narrow sense, will and should be taught, such as demography, including social statistics, philanthropy, and social psychology. In one sense all of these subjects are sociology. Some, indeed, would prefer to call demography "descriptive sociology;" and some would name the applied science of social betterment "applied or practical sociology" rather than "philanthropy;" while personally I would prefer the term "psychological sociology" instead of "social psychology." At any rate, they are all closely related subjects, and there can be no doubt that they should be taught together in any college or university where the work in sociology is well organized. My problem, therefore, becomes: How should sociology and the subjects immediately connected with it, either as its preliminary data or as its applications, be taught in a college or university?

Another difficulty presents itself in the question of the teaching force available for the teaching of these subjects; for it is manifest that they must be taught differently according as one or several men, or only one-half or one-fourth of one man, are engaged in teaching them. In most colleges and universities at the present time sociology is but a mere appendix or addendum to the department of political economy, or perhaps history or philosophy; and usually only the part of the time of one man is devoted to teaching subjects which may with any strictness be called sociological. For the purposes of this paper, however, I

shall assume that such important subjects as sociology, demography, and philanthropy cannot be properly taught in a college or university of any size without practically the whole time of at least one man being devoted to their teaching. What I shall say, therefore, about methods of teaching sociology presupposes that at least one man is giving practically all of his time to work in sociology and closely allied subjects; but, of course, the ideals set up may be, in part, adapted to conditions where only half of the time of one man can be given to those subjects.

I must disclaim at the outset any intention of laying down dogmatic rules as to how sociology and allied subjects should be taught. I have not sufficiently reflected upon the matter, nor is my experience sufficiently wide, to warrant my laying down such rules. Again, I do not believe that one teacher can make rigid rules for the guidance of another, even in the same field; the most that can be done is that a certain order and method can be indicated, and suggestions as to details given. For these reasons, and also for the sake of concreteness, I shall limit myself, in this paper, to telling what methods and organization of work I have found on the whole successful in a six-years' teaching experience at the University of Missouri.

At the University of Missouri—where a free elective system prevails—there is no course in sociology open to freshmen. During the first two years of my experience I admitted them to my elementary course, but I soon found that in general they were not mature enough to take the work with profit as I had it organized. Hence freshmen are now advised to take a general course in European history or in physiography as preparation for the courses in sociology. This is not saying, of course, that a suitable course in sociology, or rather in the descriptive study of social organization, could not be organized for freshmen. Such a course might easily be arranged, and in my opinion it would be a valuable introduction to the more intensive study of the problems of the social life attempted in the following courses. It should include, among other things, a careful study of local conditions and institutions and of neighborhood organization, a

descriptive analysis of present American society, based largely upon the census, and a study of the relations of social institutions to physiographic conditions. Such an elementary course in social analysis has not been organized at the University of Missouri, partly on account of lack of sufficient teaching force, but chiefly because the curriculum is already crowded and it seems wiser to direct the attention of students to the courses in history and physiography.

As the work in sociology has been organized at the University of Missouri, there have been three chief courses open to undergraduates. These courses are all arranged on the three-hour-a-week plan, and continue each through a year. In a college or university where the classes meet five times a week, each of these courses would be condensed to a single semester, and they could all, then, come in the junior and senior years, which, I think, would be advantageous. The three courses referred to are: (1) an introduction to the scientific study of social problems; (2) a study of the abnormal classes of society—the dependent, defective, and delinquent classes—and of the methods of scientific philanthropy in dealing with them; (3) a critical study of sociological theory.

The first course, as the name implies, is an introduction to all of the social sciences as well as to sociology. Its aim is to show the student how scientific methods may be applied to the study of social problems. The course opens with a survey of the field of the social sciences and of their relations to each other, especially to sociology, whose character as a synthetic and fundamental science of the whole field of social phenomena is emphasized. Scientific methods of studying social problems are then considered—the method of personal observation, the statistical method, the historical method, the comparative method, the evolutionary method, and the method of deduction from biology and psychology. The whole purpose of the course is to illustrate the concrete application of these methods to the problems of the social life in such a way that the essential factors in social organization and evolution will stand clearly forth. Accordingly the main part of the course is spent in examining certain typical or

fundamental social problems in the light of these scientific methods.

The first problem studied is that of the origin and evolution of the family. I may say here that it has long been my conviction that the study of the family as an institution forms the best introduction to scientific sociology, and all my experience thus far has tended to confirm this conviction. The study of the evolution of the family reveals, in a concrete way, to the elementary student of society, as nothing else can, all of the essential factors at work bringing about social changes and maintaining social order. It exhibits in miniature the social process, so that the student can analyze it without getting confused; and it exhibits it in its natural genetic setting, not in an artificial way. Moreover, the study of the family, and of the phenomena of birth-rate and death-rate which are intimately connected with the family life, serves to give the student that biological point of view which is necessary for sanity in the study of social problems. Just as there can be no sound individual psychology without the biological point of view, so there can be no sound psychological theories of the social life without its biological aspect being kept constantly in view. Finally, the study of the family, although it shows so clearly the biological factors at work in society, exhibits not less clearly the spiritual factors, such as religion, government, culture, and moral ideals; and there is, therefore, little danger of the student becoming one-sided in his views of the social process, such as there may be in the study of economic institutions.

Here I wish to express my conviction that economics, and especially theoretical economics, does not afford the best possible preparation for either philanthropy or theoretical sociology. It fails to give, not only the biological point of view, but that all-sided, well-balanced view of the social life-process which both the social worker and the student of sociological theory require. In other words, the study of economics should not precede, but should accompany or follow, such a course as I am describing.

The first semester's work in this course embraces, then, the study of the evolution of the family as an institution, including

of course the modern divorce movement, the study of the birth-rate of various countries and of various elements in our population, in connection with their respective death-rates, and finally a study of the theory of population. The whole makes up a semester's work which, one might say, is predominantly on the biological aspect of the social life-process. The second semester's work is on allied problems, of a more or less fundamental character, which grow out of the problems studied the first semester. Thus the problems of population naturally lead into the immigration problem, and this in turn brings up problems of racial adjustment, among which the negro problem is of commanding importance; finally, all these problems lead to a consideration of those connected with the growth of cities and the social conditions of urban life, with which the year's work closes, after a brief summary of the conclusions reached of value for sociological theory.

Throughout the course the point of view maintained is the sociological one—that is, the view-point of the organization and evolution of society as a whole. All problems are approached from this point of view, and made to throw light upon the real factors in social growth and organization. Moreover, the problems treated afford excellent opportunities for the illustration of the statistical, historical and comparative methods of social study, in all their complexity. Thus the instruments of independent thinking and investigating are placed in the students' hands, and they are encouraged to think for themselves. By the end of the year the thinking students are in a position to think clearly about the social life-process as a whole; while those who do not think have at least, by the scientific study of these problems, been better trained for their duties as citizens. Training for citizenship, I may say, is an aim kept constantly in view throughout the course. This is not difficult, because the first requisite in training for citizenship is, in my opinion, the securing of the scientific attitude toward all social problems.

Thus far I have said nothing about methods of instruction used in this course in the technical sense of that term. The methods of instruction used are lectures, required reading, and

quizzes. The problems treated in the course are all presented by means of lectures, and the series of lectures may accordingly be said to be the main feature of the course. I do not wish to defend the lecture method—that is not necessary. But I would point out that in an unorganized subject, like sociology, if a wide field is to be covered in a relatively brief time, the lecture method is indispensable. With relatively mature students it is, moreover, if supplemented by quizzes, required reading, or the writing of papers, liable to but little abuse. In the course I am describing wide reading is required of the students. They are first of all required to read some simple text presenting a scientific analysis of society. This has been deemed necessary because it has been found that, though they have studied history, they are not used to thinking of society objectively and analytically. They are next required to do reading along the line of the problems treated in the lectures, special reading being assigned in connection with each topic. Finally, they are encouraged to read certain elementary texts in theoretical sociology, though they are not required to do this. On a part of their reading the students are quizzed the same as on the lectures; on the rest they are required to take notes and hand them in at the end of the semester. There are frequent written quizzes upon the lectures and parts of the required reading, oral quizzes being found impracticable with large classes. No papers are required to be written in this course, as in general the students in such an introductory course are not yet prepared to write papers with profit; but mature students taking the course are permitted to write papers in lieu of doing certain required reading and handing in their notes. It would be desirable in such a course, if practicable, to require, in addition to the above, personal observation of local social conditions and institutions, but with large classes I have not found it practicable to do this.

The course which I have described is intended, not only as an introductory course to the other courses in sociology and philanthropy, but also, where a student can spend only a limited time in studying sociology, as a relatively complete elementary course.

In other words, where a student can take but one course in sociology, he is advised to take this course.

For a second course in sociology I believe that there should be made a thorough study of the abnormal or depressed classes in society, together with the scientific methods of dealing with them. The first course is rightly confined, I think, to a consideration of problems which involve directly only the normal elements of society; but the abnormal elements—by which I mean the dependent, defective, and delinquent classes—play such a part in social evolution, and their treatment is such an important concern in modern communities, that I believe that the study of them and of the methods of scientific philanthropy should follow next in order. There should be made a careful study of their biological and social genesis, of their extent and increase or decrease, of the historical development of their treatment, and of the present scientific methods of treating each particular class. These topics form a year's work at the University of Missouri in two separate, though correlated, courses. In the first semester a course called "Modern Philanthropy" deals with the genesis and treatment of the dependent and defective classes; in the second semester a course called "Criminal Sociology" deals similarly with the delinquent classes. The methods of instruction are practically the same as those employed in the first course, except that papers are now required of students on topics in which they are interested. In all courses in philanthropy it is highly desirable, of course, where the college or university is situated in a large city, to have the class visit the local charitable and correctional institutions.

After there has been a somewhat thorough study of scientific methods of social investigation and of scientific methods of social amelioration, as described in the above two courses, the student is ready for a course in sociological theory. This is sociology in the narrow sense—the theory of the organization and evolution of society; and, in my opinion, it should not generally be taken before the senior year, and should be preceded by courses in psychology as well as by the courses already discussed. If it be said that few undergraduates will take such a course upon such

conditions, the reply is that it does not matter. The first two courses that have been discussed should be taken by all academic undergraduates as a preparation for citizenship, if for no other reason; but the course in sociological theory is needed only by those who, for one reason or another, are specializing in the social sciences.

The course should be both critical and constructive. The divergences in present sociological theories should be pointed out, but points of agreement among sociologists should at the same time be emphasized. Every effort should be made to stimulate the student's own thought. Upon the basis of his already acquired knowledge of facts and principles he should be required to criticize typical sociological theories, and to formulate his own views regarding social organization and evolution. To this end original theses should be required of the class throughout the course. After a semester's work of critical study of sociological theories, more constructive work in interpreting social phenomena should be attempted upon the basis of modern psychology. This work in the psychological interpretation of social phenomena, or social psychology, should be made the goal of the whole previous work in sociology, and from its standpoint all previous positions reached may be reviewed and co-ordinated, so that by the end of the course the student will have, if not a definite system of sociology, at least the materials out of which such a system may be constructed.

What has been said about the plan of the above courses may, perhaps, be summed up by saying that in the study of sociology the study of social facts should precede the study of sociological theory, the theory being allowed to grow out of the facts; that the study of the near should precede that of the remote; and that the study of the normal should precede that of the abnormal.

The three courses outlined are, of course, but the foundation for graduate work in sociology and philanthropy. All of the problems treated in the introductory course should be covered again by graduate courses providing for more intensive study of the same problems and for research work along those lines. The same is, of course, true of all other demographical prob-

lems; and to facilitate the use of the statistical method in investigating these problems there should be provided a statistical laboratory, equipped with modern apparatus. Upon the basis of the course in philanthropy a great number of graduate courses in philanthropy and preventive social work may be developed. These courses will rapidly take on, however, a semi-professional character, and may lead in the direction of establishing a school of philanthropy. Where such semi-professional courses are given they should always be accompanied by practical social work. Finally, as continuing the work in theoretical sociology, graduate courses may be developed in the history of sociological theory, in sociological methodology, in ethnic psychology, and in the social psychology of special phases of the social life, such as art, religion, and morality.

To guard against misinterpretation, I should, perhaps, say that there is considerable greater flexibility in the course of study in my department than is indicated by what has been said above. But this has been secured largely through the addition of another man to the teaching force. The work for the first year is as I have outlined it. The work for the second year may be either the courses in philanthropy, or courses in the detailed study of the social condition of the rural and urban population of the United States. The work for the third year is either the course in theoretical sociology or courses in preventive philanthropy. Then follow, of course, for the graduate work the special courses for research on special problems, and the courses in ethnic psychology, history of sociological theory, and sociological methodology.

In concluding, permit me to say that I do not believe that in our larger universities the work in sociology and philanthropy can be properly organized unless it is divided between at least two men, one to teach theoretical sociology and the other philanthropy. The subjects are so different that they require men of different gifts and different training to teach them successfully; while each is so important that, not one man, but several men, might, in a university which is vitally in touch with the life of the people, be working in each subject.

DISCUSSION

WILLIAM G. SUMNER, YALE UNIVERSITY

When I looked over the programme of this meeting I chose to speak in the discussion on this question because it is the one that interests me most. I hope that in the course of the discussion we shall develop some useful suggestions in regard to it. The fact is, it seems to me, that today there is not anything which it is more important that all young men should learn than some of the fundamental notions of sociology. I use the term now in the broad sense of a philosophy of society, the synthesis of the other things that we sometimes include under sociology; and it seems to me that in all the public discussion that is going on, and in the matters that nowadays seem to interest people more than anything else, what they need is some sound fundamental notions that a sociologist might give them.

For instance, everybody ought to know what a society is. "Society" is a word that has a great many different uses. It is very much confused by these different uses; and at the same time a society is the fundamental thing with which sociology is concerned. The social sciences are all of them connected with particular details of social life, and if people could get an idea of what a society is, and perhaps still more exactly what it is not, it would correct and define a great number of false suggestions that nowadays perplex the public mind.

Then, again, it is most important in regard to a society that it shall be publicly understood what you can do with a society and what you cannot do with it. People who know what a society is, and what we can do with a society by our best efforts, would know that it is great nonsense to talk about the reorganization of society as a thing that people are going to take in hand as a corrective measure, to be carried out by certain social enterprises so called. What we try to do, and what we want to try to do in class work, is to give the young men and young women (where the latter are concerned) a sound idea of some of these fundamentals that would stop them from going over into a false line of effort and thought.

Now, it seems to me that in doing this one thing, what we want to do is to get down to facts; and we ought to try to stick as close to facts as we can. I don't mean statistical facts, but I mean the realities and the truth of the life around us, the life that is going on, the motives of the people, their ideas and their fallacies, the false things on which they stick their faith, and so on. And the facts all show that there ought to be understood by students of sociology all fundamental facts about society, about what it is, what is possible in it, what is not possible in it, and so on. In our work at New Haven we have that so organized that we try to have the students take courses in ethnography and some related subjects that are of a fundamental character, and form a stock of knowledge that a student of sociology ought to have. If we do not do this, sociology becomes a thing up in the air. We have a lot of abstract definitions and abstract notions that may, of course, have some philosophical value or psychological truth, but the student starting out from them is in great danger, at any rate, of going off into the old-fashioned methods of deduction from these broad notions that he starts with, and the whole thing becomes lost in the clouds. That seems to me the greatest danger that sociology nowadays has to encounter. If we allow

it to become foundationless—I mean in regard to the real fact—make it a matter of thought and deduction, we cannot expect that we shall have great effect on public opinion; we cannot expect that people will pay very much attention to us or care much about what we say. The only way that we can get an influence that we want and that we think we deserve is to keep sociology directly and constantly in touch with common everyday life and with the forms of the social order.

If I were a man forty years old, and was beginning to be a professor in one of our American colleges, I should think that the opportunity to take hold of a department of sociology, and give it shape and control its tendencies, lay down its outlines, and so on, was really the most important thing that a man nowadays could undertake, because of the tremendous importance of these social questions that are arising. There cannot be any doubt of it, and I, at any rate, am perfectly convinced of it, that within the next twenty-five or thirty years the questions that are going to shake American society to its foundations are questions of sociological character and importance. Some have already been referred to; such, for instance, as this race question that has been rising and getting more strenuous every year. It has got some truth at the bottom of it, if we can get at it, and in the end it will have to be settled from the merit that is in it, and the sociologist will have to find the truth that is in this matter. Again, such questions as are involved in conflicts about capital, are unlimited in their influence on the welfare of the American people. And if I were at the beginning of a career, instead of at the end of it, I should think there was nothing that was better worth work than to get into the minds of the young men some notions that were sound in regard to fundamental matters. Then in regard to this matter of divorce, and the way in which it is acting upon the American people. It is a question that ramifies through the whole society, and even the most dithyrambic of our orators have never gone beyond the truth of the importance of this matter to the American people.

My opinion in regard to this is that the way to build a science of sociology is to build it on the same fundamental methods that have proved so powerful in the other sciences. I mean the more or less exact sciences. We cannot pretend that we can ever make an exact science of sociology. We ought not to try. We haven't got the information, and I don't know that we ever can get it in the accurate, positive shape in which it is ascertained in the exact sciences. We are all the time dealing more or less with propositions that under certain circumstances will have to be modified. They are valuable, they are important, but more knowledge, more information, may force us to modify them. That will not do any harm. There have been sciences that have had a long and useful life, although they remained in that form. I don't think that is a fundamental difficulty, but it is one that we want to overcome so far as we can. We ought to be truly scientific so far as possible. We ought to use positive and well-tested methods, and we ought not to trust any others. The methods that we use ought to be such as would be regarded as valid at any time and anywhere, on any subject.

Now, if the young men are to be trained in this, you have got to bring them

up to it by a study of a positive character that deals with facts and information. We have thought that ethnography was at any rate one of the very broadest of these subjects. The books on sociology all refer constantly to certain things as true with regard to primitive or uncivilized people, and we ought to have a stock of knowledge about such matters that is firm and well learned, so that the students know what we are talking about. They would know at once if all the things as asserted are actually and positively true. Then we have also a course in what is called commercial geography, but it branches out a good deal from that into matters of commerce, trade, production, and so on, in different parts of the world. That is, as we think, a very strong basic course for the students who are going to study sociology. It brings them into contact with these matters from the economic side, which is more positive, at any rate, and more practical than the sociological facts as they stand at the present time. Then the economic courses: As has been well said, they have important limitations, but they furnish a convenient and practical introduction to our line of study, and we expect that study. Then, again, there is the great field of history; that furnishes us a vast amount of our material—the material on which we base our deductions and generalizations, so that a student who is going to be a sociologist never can know too much history. And if history is taught well and according to modern ideas and methods, it furnishes a very good introduction to sociological study.

Sociological study at New Haven at present is in my hands, and I have to proceed very largely by lectures, partly for the reason that the essayist has mentioned. If the lectures are made pleasant and easy, the young men will sit very attentively through the hour, and they will get up and go away without any discontent, and all will go on very happily and smoothly and uselessly. But if you are going to make lectures amount to anything, you have got to follow them up, and you have got to have tests, and you have got to apply the tests thoroughly by the old-fashioned recitation method, so that a man who doesn't pay attention and doesn't acquire the matter will suffer for it in the usual academic way. Then they have lessons in the textbook every time that they come, so that they can always turn back to the textbook and verify what ideas they think they have gained, and the matter can be held down as closely as possible to the usual academic methods. I don't know of any better methods than the classes and exercises on which we were brought up in old times. The combination of the lecture with something of that kind seems to be necessary, so that the students are required to write abstracts every five or six lectures. These abstracts are carefully examined, and students get marks for them which tell on the standing and the final academic results, in the usual form.

Now I am about at the end of it. Only one or two more years remain and I am most interested now to know what can be done for the sake of the future, for those who will come after and take up the work and carry it on. I hope we shall get up a discussion here—if necessary, a quarrel—which will develop ideas about this matter that will help. Somebody asked me last evening if this was going to be a gay discussion, and I said it had possibilities of a very gay discussion; and, Mr. Chairman, it is what I hope we shall have in the remainder of the session.

PROFESSOR FREDERICK MORGAN DAVENPORT, HAMILTON COLLEGE, CLINTON, N. Y.

There has never been any question of the necessity of sociology as a training for citizenship since Spencer wrote his chapter on "Our Need of It" a full generation ago, and there never has been any question of the interest which this subject is capable of arousing in the mind of the student since it became evident that sociology is the deepest of the humanities, reaching to the very marrow of the life of man.

As soon as we shall be able to rid ourselves still more fully of that haunting classical fetish that "never flitting, still is sitting on the pallid bust of Pallas, just above" the entrance door of so many of our colleges even yet, we shall be able to begin the study of the science of society earlier than we have hitherto supposed. We are just beginning to appreciate how keen the youthful mind is for scientific truth—how much more easily it is apprehended than unnatural grammar, for example. I expect to see the day when sociology will be taught in the higher grades of the public schools in a simple, straightforward fashion. But whether that ever comes or not, in the college we should introduce it, I think, as early in the course as possible, not later than the last half of sophomore year or the first half of junior year. Biology and psychology should come before sociology, but elementary sociology should precede college inquiry into history, economics, jurisprudence, and politics.

There should be preparation at least in the last half of sophomore year, which shall give the student a grasp on the general principles of biology and psychology which are unquestionably at the foundation of sociological study, in order that he may apprehend the simpler relations between the science of life and the science of society, and especially between the science of mind and the science of society. There is need of preparation in biology, not so much that the student may trace any analogy between the individual organism and the social organism, but in order that he may grasp those fundamental biological truths of heredity and adaptation to environment, of variation, struggle, and survival, that he may become familiar with the evolutionary changes which the human species is undergoing as the result of adaptation to a changing and differentiating social environment.

There is no need for anyone to plead in our time that psychology is the very heart of sociology; that, however much truth there may be in the organic analogy, the psychical view of society is everywhere winning its way. A careful training in the fundamental principles of biology and psychology—then sociology, before history, economics, jurisprudence, or politics.

And why before these subjects? Because the study of history, for example, is revolutionized if there is clearly in the mind of the student, at the threshold of historical inquiry, the great path of social evolution—zigzagging for some populations, lost in the morass for others, but, just as surely as progress goes on, following in the main one steadfast upward way out of horde and tribal life into civilization and progress and democracy. So much is the debt of history to sociology felt in our time that there is no history in our day worth anything which is not written from the sociological standpoint. Not the doings of kings, but the phenomena of social progress. Not the gossip of the court or the spoil of the strong, but the advancing growth and organization of the nation. Who

can understand economics who has not first camped on its sociological frontier? And who jurisprudence who is not familiar with the social sources of the common law? Or who politics who is not acquainted with the social evolution of government and public opinion? Who is competent to judge of the value of proposed practical reform, who can sift a programme of social policy, without that balance, that social standard of judgment, which comes from a broad view of community failures and community successes in the long ages that are gone?

But the question may be asked: Is sociological theory clearly enough defined so that it may be taught as a discipline fundamental to a particular group of studies? I think so. I think we have passed the danger-point. I think there is no longer cause to fear that we may split up into warring sects like the theologians. Our sociological geniuses, though they seem to differ, are in reality only laying emphasis upon important phases of the whole subject. Although no one would claim that we have a complete and authoritative body of principles, enough is clear, I think, to form a simple and beautiful body of theory.

I hope we are agreed upon the unit of investigation in sociology, upon the fundamental psychological character of the subject, that the description of society must be in psychological and not biological terms. I hope we are agreed with respect to the evolutionary nature of the social process, and that it is important to attempt to correlate the social process with the great cosmic process of evolution; that this social process is complicated and modified by the ever-expanding reason of man; that more and more the guide of social progress is intellectual progress. I hope we are agreed upon the general path of social evolution of a population out of horde and tribal darkness into civil organization and liberty and democracy. I hope we are agreed that progress costs in suffering, in injustice, even in degeneration; that society is morally responsible for the costs of its own progress; that the mind of the many must set itself to control economic greed, industrial suffering, and to modify that extreme tension of life which manifests itself in suicide, insanity, pauperism, vice, and crime. I think we have a very beautiful body of theory.

We should begin with simple, straightforward sociological theory—not with the causes of pauperism and the statistics of population, but with sociology as a philosophy of national life and progress. Not that this should be the whole content of our teaching, but the early foundation of it. We should teach, not the disagreements of sociologists—we can thresh them out elsewhere—but well-defined and certain conclusions as they seem to us, and do it as clearly and simply and briefly as we can. I think we should not proceed on the principle that sociological theory is still in a chaotic condition—that very wide inductions are still necessary before there is any talk of principle. I should like to know what Ward and Giddings and Small, and all the rest of our domestic and foreign sociological saints, have bled and suffered and died for anyway except to make the path of sociological investigation easier for each successive generation by setting up guide-posts all along the way.

I believe in a union of theory and history; that each step of the social process should be made clear to undergraduates by a wealth of illustration, a wide survey—but not too wide, not Spencer's *Principles of Sociology*, but a far briefer and more definite application of event and fact to principle. A sim-

ple and, as far as possible, untechnical setting-forth of the well-defined principles of sociology, together with a sufficient number of significant examples of the great facts of social evolution—this should, I think, constitute the primary course in the sociological study of the colleges. If only a single course is possible, there is just one thing I should add to the content of it; a free parliament in practical sociological problems of contemporary life—an absolutely open and free discussion between members of the class, and between members of the class and the instructor, upon the social aspect of divorce, of pauperism, of crime, of cities, of settlement work, of factory legislation, of trades-unions and corporations, and other like problems.

If there can be but one course, I should go no farther. But if it is possible to go farther—and it will be increasingly possible in undergraduate instruction—then in a higher course we may proceed to a more intensive study of general sociology, to the criticism of disagreements and discordant elements; we may make use of what we have gained in description, in analysis and classification, and proceed to widen the range of inductive research and generalization—especially by the use of the quantitative form of the historical method—leaving for a later course, or perhaps for graduate study, the delicate inductions of cause and law, and the setting-up of the social standards of judgment that shall guide us in the midst of the complex economic and political programmes of our time.

Sociology has a great future in a nation which depends as much as we do upon the intelligence and the will of its citizenship. Sociology is a fundamental study for citizens, in order that they may substitute for the notion that political conduct must be a matter of log-rolling and compromise, that short views are best, and that life is too brief for remote considerations, that an untrained common-sense is most trustworthy—in order that we may substitute for all these that higher notion that political conduct may be made a matter of scientific prevision, of public control through public reason and public opinion, and that the facts upon which prevision and public opinion may be grounded are to be found by inquiry of what has been, what is, what tends to be in social evolution.

JEFFREY R. BRACKETT, PH.D., DIRECTOR OF THE SCHOOL FOR SOCIAL WORKERS,
BOSTON

I venture to speak briefly of instruction in one part of the great field of sociology—that of applied social ethics. I use the word “applied,” for the word “practical” would seem to mean that the study of theories of social activities may not be practical. There is surely no study more practical than the effort by true scientific work to put forth theories and general principles for the guidance of conduct.

Dr. Ellwood has well laid stress on the value of the study of the family at the beginning of a course. I venture to ask if there should not be instruction, by way of preparation for our courses, in such subjects as physiology, psychology, and hygiene, that we may know more of the bodily and mental elements with which we deal, and the effect of physical environment upon them.

The visiting of institutions is doubtless helpful, but I would urge for every student, if time and circumstances allow, some personal work which will bring him or her into intimate touch with at least one family whose condition of living

is very different from his own. For instance, a student whose life has been spent within a narrow circle of prosperity may, through a social settlement, lead a boys' club or be set to follow the activities of a central labor organization. Another, who has had few opportunities and a struggle, may well be placed in some agency, as a civic league, in which persons of opportunities and means are working for the common good. If possible, the work should be with two agencies, under skilled direction, differing in immediate aims. But there is hardly a student near a large community who cannot give at least one hour a week to friendly acquaintance with one family, or with one boy under probation, or with a group of children with a "home library," or to some other such bit of friendly service. It should continue during the academic year, at least.

The object of all such work is chiefly to give the student new points of view, and a larger power of interpretation of conditions and needs.

Work in applied social ethics should approach as nearly as possible to the "case work," which is doing so much in the study of law and medicine. Case work can be brought into the class in the form of detailed study, step by step, of particular problems of needy individuals or of neighborhood work. It should be done, however, by persons who know well, by personal knowledge if possible, the working-out of the particular problems.

The details of such work may seem trivial to some students, even to advanced ones. If so, there is all the more reason why this work should be done. It shows the relation in social ethics of little tasks well done to the larger issues. That is just as true in the study of social ethics as in medicine. General measures looking to prevention of ills, to improved conditions, must rest in large part on the knowledge which comes from detailed work in remedy and cure.

PROFESSOR ROBERT C. CHAPIN, BELOIT COLLEGE

My point of view is that of the independent college, already so ably represented by Professor Davenport. With all that has been said with regard to the study of sociology as training for citizenship I am in hearty agreement, and shall not try to say it over again in feebler words.

The chief emphasis of the work of the detached college falls upon general, as distinguished from specialized, professional, and technical training. I believe that there is much truth in President Hadley's position that the most important training for citizenship that the college course gives comes from the experience of the student in adjusting himself to the social environment of the college, and finding his place as a good citizen in the sharing of the common burdens and responsibilities of student-life. Yet the formal study of social relationships in the larger world without may be made a valuable means of cultivating the social spirit and the habit of viewing social questions with reference to the common rather than the individual interests involved.

In my own teaching of undergraduates I have found it advantageous to begin with the study of social groups near at hand rather than remote, those present rather than those of the distant past. The college community itself affords a good illustration of many social phenomena, and I have found that students are easily interested in subjecting their familiar organizations and

activities to analysis. I have also been wont to start them upon an investigation of the communities from which they came. Many of them have their homes in rural communities, or in villages of manageable size, and they have often made very suggestive social studies of these. The college town has been studied in the same way, a different aspect of the city's organization being assigned to each member of the class, and the results compared and collated. In these ways the habit of observing the sociological significance of common facts is acquired, and an interest stimulated in those generalizations which apply, not only to small groups, but to the great national aggregates.

My own experience has been that it is difficult at the outset to interest undergraduates in the abstract generalizations of social theory and I should defer theoretical sociology until a good deal of the concrete matter of the separate social sciences had been presented—perhaps leave it for the most part for the work of the graduate school. Even granting that sociology has a body of doctrine as well established as that taught in economics, politics, etc., it is certainly not so large in amount, nor, in my opinion, so well adapted to younger minds as the more concrete data of the specific social sciences. I should therefore advise having the student get as much history and psychology and economics as he can before he undertakes the study of pure sociology. On the other hand, I should stipulate that these studies be taught from the sociological point of view, and not as mere matters of refinement of technical processes of research.

On one point further I must express dissent, although with diffidence, from what has been said. It seems to me that the study of pathological conditions—of pauperism and crime—lies outside the limits of the college course. I believe that more can be done for students, even in the way of preparing them to deal with these problems in after-life, by giving them a good understanding of normal social structure and its processes, and by inculcating the broad social point of view, than by initiating them into the detail of abnormal phenomena.

PROFESSOR J. ELBERT CUTLER, UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

My experience in the teaching of sociology, mainly in a Massachusetts college for women, has impressed upon my mind the desirability of field-work in connection with the teaching of the subject. The possibility, the practicability, of such work varies with the character, the situation, and the surroundings of each institution where the subject is taught. But it is my belief that wherever possible, and to the utmost degree to which it is possible, field-work in connection with the teaching of sociology is extremely desirable. By field-work I mean, in general, expeditions to institutions and to districts and places illustrative of points discussed in the classroom, with reports, oral or written (or both), embodying the students' impressions and ideas.

This work I believe to be desirable for at least three reasons:

1. This requires of the student work that is at once interesting and valuable—interesting because of novelty of experience, if for no other reason; valuable because of the kind of training that it gives. To observe intelligently, to record accurately, and to generalize cautiously and prudently, are requirements in the attainment of which all the powers of the mind are brought into use, and they

are thus trained and subjected to the discipline that is necessary for complete development. It is therefore in accord with the end and purpose of a collegiate course.

2. The present stage of the science of sociology justifies only a minimum amount of generalization in the teaching of the subject. The generalizations that are used must be regarded as working hypotheses merely. This, I think, the student should be given to understand at the outset. If this is done, then the student may rightly be encouraged to test these hypotheses, to find material that is illustrative and corroborative, or to find instances that apparently do not support the principles that have been advanced. This method of approach, it seems to me, is productive of the deepest interest in the subject on the part of the student.

3. Field-work has a broadening and deepening influence on the student's sympathies; it trains for citizenship. Class feeling and social prejudices, at least if very pronounced, are believed to be harmful in a democracy. There is no more effective way, during the college course, so far as the work of the teacher is concerned, of promoting the development of a democratic spirit, a spirit of good citizenship and public service, and of dispelling the ominous clouds that arise out of narrow-mindedness and ignorance, than by carefully directed sociological investigation.

Students of sociology have shown a marked tendency "to go off on a tangent," as I call it—to become to all intents and purposes individuals of one idea. They seem to be prone to seize upon a single evil or some particular instance of social injustice, or perhaps some special form of social betterment; and soon they are out on a tangent and have lost their bearings, so far as sociology as a whole is concerned. This is almost sure to happen frequently, it seems to me, if students receive their instruction in sociology somewhat as if they were shut up in a cloister. For the student of sociology it is very desirable that his first attempts to solve the problems of modern society be made under close supervision and direction.

To my mind socialism, which most students have a desire to know something about, and to which some consideration must be given in one way or another, cannot really be understood or altogether satisfactorily studied in the classroom alone. Field-work in sociology, intimate acquaintance with the hard facts of everyday experience, not merely in one group or class, but in various groups, under various conditions, is what enables a student to understand the powerful appeal, the force and vitality, of socialism as a doctrine, as propaganda. On the other hand, it also enables a student to realize the limitations of socialism as a practical programme, the very great difficulties that must be overcome in making a practical application of the principles of socialism.

I would not, however, minimize the importance of a study of the historical development of social institutions. That is highly important, indeed indispensable. I would merely add that that is likely to leave the student in the dead past, bewildered before the living present, unless it be supplemented by a first-hand knowledge and analysis of present-day conditions and problems.

There are only one or two serious objections to field-work in connection with the teaching of sociology:

1. Possible notoriety. Where classes are large, students must carry on field-

work in groups. Often the instructor must accompany the students. Students doing field-work under such circumstances are very apt to attract the attention of newspaper reporters and become a target for their witticisms. I can only say that, so far as my experience goes, notoriety can be avoided. For two years, once every two weeks, groups of my students were more or less publicly studying sociology, for a half-day or more at a time, outside the classroom. Only once in the two years did we become the prey of the reporter, and on that occasion it was the result of a misunderstanding which caused my plans to miscarry.

2. The baneful effect on the individuals who are visited and whose character and surroundings are studied. Here again my experience leads me to think that their feelings need not be disregarded or in any sense outraged. In some cases I found it possible to establish perfectly natural relationships through co-operation with settlement workers. I have also found city and state officials very courteous and obliging in the matter of permitting students to study their methods of administration.

3. The time required on the part of both student and teacher. This I admit to be a serious objection. It is the most serious of all, I think. But through co-operation with settlement workers, with public officials, with alumni, it is possible to minimize the time required. In any case, the value of a method must be judged according to the results that it gives; and I believe the results obtained from field-work, in general, to be worth all the time and the effort.

A friend with whom I was conversing while on the train coming to Providence said that he was endeavoring to use the case method in his courses in sociology—the case method not merely in the study of what may be termed the pathological conditions of society, but in the study also of what may be called the ordinary, normal, and typical conditions. That, in a word, is what I have in mind and what I advocate. It is desirable at the present time to use the case method just as far as possible in the teaching of sociology.